

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested. Claims 1-28 are in this case. Claims 1-26 have been rejected. Independent claims 1 and 15, and dependent claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 23, have now been amended. Dependent claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 22 have been canceled. Claims 27 and 28 have been added.

The Applicant believes that the claims before the Examiner now correspond substantially to allowable subject matter, as will be detailed below.

Doctrine of Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 26 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,686,941. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

While continuing to traverse the Examiner's rejection, and without in any way prejudicing the patentability of the rejected claims, the Applicant has, in order to expedite the prosecution, chosen to file a terminal disclaimer (contemporaneously with the filing of this Official Action response) limiting the term of this application to terminate on the same date as U.S. Patent No. 6,686,941, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejections based upon U.S. Patent No. 6,686,941.

§ 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 8-9, 14-21 and 24-25 under § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Dalal et al. (US 5,999,201). The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-2, 6 and 15 under § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Konishi et al. (US 4,720,707). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

While continuing to traverse the Examiner's rejections, and without in any way prejudicing the patentability of the rejected claims, the Applicant has, in order to expedite the prosecution, chosen to amend independent claims 1 and 15. Dependent claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 23, have also been amended to reflect the amendments to their associated independent claims.

Amended Claim 1 is now directed to a display system having:

a display screen including one endless imaging belt (disclosed in originally filed claim 7 and page 10, lines 7-10);

a printing means including at least three toner reservoirs and three writing means, each of the toner reservoirs being configured for containing a different color toner, each of the toner reservoirs being associated with one of the writing means (disclosed in originally filed claim 9 and page 10, lines 7-10); the writing means are configured for a fusionless transfer of said different color toner from said toner reservoirs onto said one endless imaging belt, such that said printing means forms a non-fused multicolored image on said one endless imaging belt (the term "fusionless" is defined to exclude even partially fusing the toner to the belt, the term "fusionless transfer" is implied from the disclosure of the originally filed application page 13, lines 1-9 and page 14, lines 6-10, whereby if the toner is even partially fused to the belt it would be impossible to remove the toner with static eliminators, therefore the transfer must be fusionless, the term "multicolored image" being disclosed in the originally filed application page 10, lines 7-10 whereby a color image is created from the four printing means, i.e. a multicolored image);

an erasing means for erasing said multicolored image from said one endless imaging belt (disclosed in originally filed claim 1); and

a drive means operationally connected to said one endless imaging belt for moving said one endless imaging belt from a printing position to a viewing position (disclosed in originally filed claim 2).

First, amended claim 1 now includes the limitations of now canceled claim 9. Claim 9 was not anticipated by Konishi, as confirmed by the Examiner.

Second, amended claim 1 now includes the limitation of a fusionless transfer such that the printing means forms a non-fused multicolored image on the one endless imaging belt.

Dalal teaches four separate printing devices each having an associated drum 100. Each printing device transfers its toner onto its associated drum 100. The toner from the four drums 100 is then transfused to a belt 110. The toner is not just transferred to belt 110, but it is transfused (in other words, transferred and fused). The fused image on belt 110 is then transferred to recording sheet 26. It is essential that the toner is transfused to belt 110 and not just transferred without fusion, as this ensures proper transfer of the image from belt 110 to recording sheet 26 (see Dalal, column 4, lines 34-45).

Therefore, as Dalal does not teach transferring toner, without fusion, in order to form a multicolored image on a belt, Dalal does not read on the amended claim 1. In addition, it would not even be obvious to use a non-fusing transfer of toner with Dalal, as Dalal explicitly teaches away from using a non-fusing transfer of toner.

Claim 15 has now been amended to include the limitations of now canceled claim 22. Claim 22, was only rejected over U.S. Patent 6,686,941. The rejection of

claim 22 has been rendered moot by the filing of a terminal disclaimer contemporaneously with this response.

New Claims

New claim 27 is directed to a display system including:

a display screen including at least three nested endless imaging belts (disclosed in originally filed claim 4, Fig. 3 and page 9, lines 17-22);

a printing means including at least three toner reservoirs and at least three writing means, each of the toner reservoirs being configured for containing a different color toner, each of the toner reservoirs being associated with a different one of the writing means, each of the writing means being associated with a different one of the belts (disclosed on page 9, lines 23-25 and page 12, lines 16-20), each of the writing means being configured for transferring toner from an associated one of the toner reservoirs onto a different one of the belts thereby forming a mono-colored image on each of the belts (disclosed on page 13, lines 5-12), the mono-colored image of each of the belts being superimposed so as to form a multicolored image on the display screen (disclosed on page 13, lines 13-15);

at least three erasing means for erasing the mono-colored image from each of the belts (disclosed on page 14, lines 6-7 and see elements 46c, 46m and 46y of Fig. 3), the belts being spaced apart so that the mono-colored image is erased from each of the belts by erasing only one side of each of the belts (disclosed in Fig. 3); and

a drive means operationally connected to the belts for moving the belts from a printing position to a viewing position (disclosed in originally filed claim 2).

New claim 27 includes the limitation that the belts are spaced apart so that the mono-colored image is erased from each of the belts by erasing only one side of each

of the belts. The term only one side is defined to exclude having to remove toner from both sides of any of the belts. This limitation is not taught by any of the cited prior art.

New claim 28 is directed to a method for displaying a color image, including the steps of:

providing a printing means supported by a roller track (disclosed on page 11, lines 12-15);

transferring the color image on to at least one display screen, by the printing means (disclosed on page 9, lines 13-14);

moving the printing means longitudinally along the roller track (disclosed on page 11, 13-15);


moving the display screen from a printing position to a viewing position (disclosed on page 13, lines 5-15); and

erasing the color image from the display screen (disclosed on page 9, line 25 to page 10, line 1).

New claim 28 is a method claim based upon allowed claim 1 of the parent case of this application (U.S. 6,686,941).

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 15, 27 and 28, and hence also dependent claims 3, 5-7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-21 and 23-26, are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883

Date: October 28, 2004